LOUISE HARDING ANSWERS DULLES

Chadband was Unabashed:

Nehru spoke up angrily, charging that "the will of nearly all Europe and Asia was flouted by the vote of the United States and its Latin American Allies in the United Nations, that barred India from the Korean peace conference" (AP).

He called the refusal to seat China "completely unreal" and "artificial". He decried the mixing of religion with politics, and asserted:

"A strong policy these days, apparently means going about looking ferocious and telling everybody we will punish them if they don't behave as we like."

Dulles, however, continued these tactics, in his address to the General Assembly of the "UN" (Sept. 17), when he said that the Grand Alliance (in WW II) was "the product of Fascist danger" and disappeared when that threat was overcome.

Untrue: the Hitler threat arose because the tories of Great Britain, USA, and France, encouraged Hitler as a check to social revolution. Hitler was hailed by Halifax, for example, as "the Number One Enemy of Bolshevism". It really became serious after the Spanish Republic had been strangled by the treachery of these same tory forces.

George Seldes ("The People Don't Know") tells how the Chicago Tribune, not even waiting for the surrender of Japan, asked in June 1945, whether it would not be a good idea to declare war on Russia right away, win a quick and easy and cheap victory with the atom bomb. Russia was then terribly devastated, having been fighting 200 German divisions in the East, while the allies took on 20.

"Possibly we ought to destroy the Stalin government while we can," editorialized the Tribune. "It could be done within 48 hours with terrifying results....."

Says Dulles, "New fears reached a peak when the Korean aggression occurred." Also, "It is to the eternal credit of the United Nations that it was not then indifferent. The Security Council promptly called upon its members to help the victims of aggression."

Dulles should be promptly "called" on this claim, for which he cannot advance one word of proof. Sir John Pratt, the eminent authority on Far Eastern affairs, stated:

"The United Nations' telegram from Seoul did not say it was aggression, nor did it say who began it. It merely said that each side accused the other. The State Department published Acheson's speech in a pamphlet which purported to contain all the relevant documents, but this telegram, the one vital document in the case, was omitted. It was omitted also from the British White Paper on Korea laid before Parliament." Pratt called this "the lie that led to war."

The Australian war correspondent, Wilfred G. Burchett, says he was convinced since Truman's declaration of the "cold war" that the real rulers of US and Britain were bent on crushing the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. He cites former US Secretary of the Navy, Francis Mathews, who on August 25, 1950, made a speech in Boston demanding a preventive war "which would cast us in a character new to a true democracy—an initiator of a war of aggression.....the first aggressors for peace." Secretary of Defence, Louis Johnson, made a number of speeches along the same lines, while Truman made the classic statement that he was determined "to have world peace even if America had to fight the Soviet Union to gain it."

UN military observers completed a tour of the parallel on June 25 and reported no unusual signs of activity that would suggest the North was preparing to invade the South. The report of this tour was not dispatched, however, until June 29 and reached Lake Success on June 30.

According to Burchett's uncontroverted recital of the facts:

> The first news that an invasion had taken place was broadcast by Pyongyang radio. The first news from the South came in a communique signed by General MacArthur on June 25. This was, to say the least, surprising in view of the fact that South Korea was supposed to be a sovereign state. There was no UN Com-

mission report that the North had invaded the South. The UN Commission neither at that time nor since carried out an investigation or reported its own findings as to who launched the assault.....The UNC report on which was based United Nations aggression against Korea commenced with the words: "The government of South Korea states." (In other words, "Rhee states." —L.H.)

The only other report was a deliberate distortion of a cable from Ambassador Muccio which was read to Trygve Lie in the small hours of the morning stating textually:

"The American ambassador to the Republic of Korea has informed the Department of State that North Korean forces invaded the territory of the Republic of Korea at several points in the early morning hours of June 25."

This was one of those historic pieces of deceit which the Americans have practised throughout the entire handling of the Korean question. Muccio's cable actually read:

"According to Korean reports which are partly confirmed by the Korean Militar Advisory Group, the Field Adviser reports that North Korean forces invaded Republic of Korea territory at several points this morning."

This was presented to Lie as an on-the-spot report from the Military Advisory Group, whereas in fact once again the message was based on Rhee reports only partly confirmed—which might well mean that the Field Advisers had confirmed that fighting had broken out. (emphasis added)

.....Even before the first meeting of the Security Council on June 27, Washington had already announced that military aid, including air support, was being given South Korea. Several hours before the Council met, Truman announced he had ordered "United States air and sea forces to give the Korean government troop cover and support" and that he had ordered the American 7th Fleet to "protect" Formosa and was sending military missions to the Philippines and French Indo-China.....No evidence has been produced to prove that the North attacked the South.

Burchett quotes from an interview given by Rhee to Joseph L. Johnston, vice-president of United Press, which was published in the Seoul Shinmun, Oct. 8, 1949. It has this

"Syngman Rhee, President of the Republic of South Korea, said that his government is able to occupy North Korea thereby bringing about the unification of the country, but that in doing so he had been warned that it may bring about a possible third World War. What he told me is as follows: 'North Koreans have requested that I should broadcast a message appealing to the loyal Koreans in the North to rise and overthrow the Communist regime and they are expecting that we will join them. I am firmly convinced that we can occupy Pyongyang within 3 days. To defend our country on the borders of Manchuria and Korea would be easier than defending it along the 38th parallel.....(but) the United Nations and United States have warned me to the effect that such an action might create another World War. This is the reason why we are still patient.....'"

(Cho Byung-ok, Rhee's ambassador to the US, sent Rhee a report, Nov. 2, 1949, in which) he deals with the unfavorable reaction in the US to one of the sabre-rattling statements of Shin Sung-mo, Rhee's Defense Minister, published in the Nov. 1 issue of the NY Herald Tribune. Cho explained he had no criticism of the plans but felt they should not have been openly published.

"I am of the firm conviction," he continued, "that the unification of Korea can be brought about only through exercise of the sovereign power of our Government.....The cold war cannot go on indefinitely like this. All these world problems could not be possibly solved without a third World War. Our plan of achieving unification must be mapped out in march with the developments of the world situation as a whole....."

The year 1949 drew to a close with Rhee firmly determined that come what may, the invasion of the North would take place in 1950. In a New Year message to the Korean people, published in all South Korean papers on December 31, Rhee said:

"In the New Year we shall all strive as one man to regain the lost territory. Up to

ıow, in view of the international situation, we have pursued a peaceful policy corres-
ɔonding to the peaceful policy of the United Nations and the United States. We must re-
nember, however, that in the New Year, in accordance with the changed international
ɜituation, it is our duty to unify Southern and Northern Korea by our own strength."

Writes Burchett:

....whatever the official coolness to such a project might have been in Washington or Lake Success, there is no doubt that Rhee was being encouraged every step of the way by Washington's representatives in South Korea, both military and diplomatic in the persons of Roberts and Muccio.

At this time Kim Hyo-suk was Minister of the Interior under Rhee. He subsequently
ɔld of numerous conversations with Rhee, Roberts, and Muccio. Burchett continues:

Kim Hyo-suk recounts that in mid-January he was called to the office of the Ministry of National Defence and had a conference with Shin Sung-mo (Defence Minister, and collaborator with the Japanese) and Roberts, where the latter said, "The expedition against the North is now an established plan and the time of its execution is not far ahead of us.....Naturally the north-bound expedition will be started by us. But we must have, though it's a formality, a reasonable excuse for doing so....."

An "Agreement for Joint Defence and Mutual Assistance" was signed between the USA and South Korea on January 26, 1950, under the terms of which South Korea was placed within the perimeter of the American "line of defence". Shortly after the agreement was signed, Rhee and his Chief of Staff, Cha Pyeng-duk (who held the highest rank attained by any Korean in the Japanese army) left for Tokyo for a conference with MacArthur.

January seems to have been the turning point in American policy favoring wholehearted support for war in Korea. Undoubtedly policy-makers were influenced by the complete collapse of Chiang Kai-shek, by British recognition of People's China and growing support for China's admission to the UN; by the impending liberation of Formosa which MacArthur believed would take place in July, 1950.....

In the NY Times of March 14, 1950, staff correspondent Sullivan reported that 13 members of the Rhee Assembly had been arrested and sentenced to from 18 months to 10 years' imprisonment for violations of the Security Act. Among the five charges levelled against them was that of opposing the invasion of North Korea by the ROK Army. Of all the masses of evidence on the public record, proving Rhee's intentions to invade the North, this is probably the most conclusive and must have been deliberately publicised by Rhee in his arrogant certainty of a quick victory.....It was no accident that a top-flight NY Times correspondent from Hong Kong made a Korean tour in May, or that Marguerite Higgins of the NY Herald Tribune was switched to Korea from Europe at about the same time.....

On June 14, 1950, Ambassador Chang reported to Rhee...that John Foster Dulles ....would soon be visiting Korea. Chang had just returned to the USA from Seoul. "On the day of my arrival," he wrote Rhee, "I arranged a small dinner party in honour of Mr. Dulles. (He said he told Rhee, among other things) "We want to see that Formosa will be protected by the United States because of its invaluable strategic location." .....On June 18, Rhee sent a message back to Chang.

This mentioned the Dulles speech to the SK Assembly.

In this speech, delivered the same day that Rhee wrote to Chang, Dulles, speaking to the South Korean Assembly at the very moment when the movement for peaceful unification was approaching its climax, said: "The eyes of the free world are upon you. Compromise with Communism would be to take the road leading to disaster."

He went on to tell the Assembly members of the "readiness of the United States to give all necessary moral and material support to South Korea which is fighting so valiantly against Communism."

Whatever might have been the feelings of the majority of the members of the Assembly toward peaceful unification, Dulles made it clear that he considered such a conception as treachery.

Rhee's July 18 letter continues: "I had several conversations and an hour's talk (with Dulles) today and he fully agreed that the Southeast Asia pact does not mean anything.....He agreed with all my policy and no doubt will do his best after his return....." In the preceding pages Rhee's policy has been clearly enough outlined and documented, so there can be no doubt that the policy with whi Dulles agreed was that of an armed invasion of North Korea under the guise of unification.....

Two days later, Dulles wrote Rhee's Foreign Secretary, Lim Byung-chick: "Above all, I appreciated the opportunity of discussing with you and with President Rhee some of the hard problems that we face, problems that will require courageous and bold decisions."

Burchett continues:

After Dulles returned from the 38th parallel, he had a final conference with Rh and Shin Sung-mo at which, according to Kim Hyo-suk, Dulles actually gave the word to launch the attack immediately, stating:

"Start the invasion against the North accompanied by counter-propaganda to th effect that the North has invaded the South. If you can but hold out for two weeks, everything will go smoothly, for during this period the USA, by accusing North Korea of attacking South Korea, will compel the United Nations to take action. And in the name of the United Nations, land, naval and air forces will be mobilised."

While Dulles was inspecting the final preparations at the 38th parallel (No explanation has ever been offered for Dulles being on the 38th parallel, just before war started, with an armoured train. The presence of this train was mentioned in the London Times.—L.H.) Secretary of War Louis Johnson and Chief of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Omar Bradley, arrived in Tokyo for a conference with MacArthur on June 18. Dulles himself went back to Tokyo from Korea and after a conference with MacArthur was reported by Associated Press to be in exuberant mood and predicted "positive action" by the United States to preserve peace in the Far East.

Burchett mentions John Gunther's (unwilling) confirmation:

Gunther was in Tokyo at the time, gathering material for his book, The Riddle of MacArthur. On the morning of June 25 he was on an excursion to Nikko with tw important members of MacArthur's staff. Just before lunch one of these staff officers was called to the telephone. "He came back," writes Gunther, "and whispered a big story has just broken. The South Koreans have attacked North Korea." Gunther in his typical leaning-over-backwards-to-be-fair attitude advises the reader not to attach too much importance to this as the officer might have had a garbled version of the affair. The story is of course perfect confirmation from an unusually reliable source—in the circumstances—of exactly what did happen.

Burchett mentions that Gunther is an apologist for MacArthur. It is not likely that an important staff officer for MacArthur would get a "garbled version" of the beginning of the war.

The writer of these notes, almost from the very beginning, has been firmly convinced that Rhee, encouraged by US militarists, started the Korean war; Sir John Pratt was right when he said, "The whole foreign policy of the United States is founded on a lie

Piffle:

Dulles, in his talk to the UN General Assembly, asserted that "Military force which is within a single nation can be used offensively at the dictation of one government alone, sometimes of one man alone." This is exactly what happened with the "United Nations" and Truman.

Also, "Military force which is distributed throughout several countries cannot be used effectively unless all of the countries concerned are in agreement. Such agreement would be totally unattainable except for operations responsive to the clear menace of aggression." This is, indeed, audacious. When Truman put the US into the war, there

was no scintilla of proof that the North started the armed conflict. And there was none when the "UN" obediently fell in line, in obedience to the interests of the tory class, and in deference to the monetary resources of USA.

The following is worse than piffle. In view of the excellent opportunities Dulles has had to learn what took place abroad, it must be classified as

Deliberate Falsification:

"It may be asked, what do we fear? I could speak of that at length. But in order to avoid what might be provocative, I confine myself to a single summarizing fact: Since 1939, some 600,000,000 people of some 15 nations have been brought into the Soviet camp of dictatorships, and in no case has this come about by voluntary action of the peoples and nations concerned. History records no more frightening fact."

Here are some excerpts from George Seldes' expose regarding the revolution in Czechoslovakia, which took place in February 1948. Seldes—an accurate reporter—in "The People Don't Know" contradicts the stories carried in the controlled press of the US and states:

> The National Socialist, the People's and the Slovak Democratic Parties lost control of the government, and the new coalition regime of non-partisans, Social Democrats, Communists, Slovak Freedom Party, and others formed a new administration which divided the land and nationalized the factories in accordance with the Constitution proclaimed by Benes in 1945.
>
> Was the new regime legally constituted? One reliable reply is the following: "The crisis was precipitated by the resignation of the members of three parties of the National Front...The new Government has been installed in a constitutional way.....In 1918 Czechoslovakia carried through a change without bloodshed. It was the same this time." The author: Jan Masaryk—in an interview with the Paris daily L'Ordre, reprinted in Daily Review, Prague, March 2, 1948.

So in China. Writers who are moderately well informed and fair, acknowledge that the small communist armies—at first greatly out-numbered by the American-armed and trained Chiang troops—could never have grown so tremendously if they had not had the support of the people.

But Dulles spews out this stuff; and the mass of the American people, immersed in radio accounts of prizefights and ball games, is utterly incompetent to check up on him.

If Dulles were capable of honesty, he would answer his question, "what do we fear", very differently. The "we" represents extreme reaction: the fear is over the fact that Russia demonstrates the fact—if truth were known—that people can live prosperously and happily after Monopoly Capitalism has been completely put out of business. Today, wretched India looks over her back fence, and makes this contrast: at home, famine—people falling dead of starvation; but in China, where the same used to occur, all is different. "None shall starve," said the new regime; and none have starved. Floods have recurred in China, since the projects to avert them have not been entirely completed; but food is rushed in from other provinces. US Reaction does not want our people to understand about this: so it has drawn a customhouse curtain and keeps out informative literature from the New China. Through someone who knows, news has come to your reporter about the great quantity of such magazines and papers stacked up in customhouses. This is less spectacular than burning in the public square, but it is also less honest and informative.

Says Dulles, "We shall, I hope, never grow weary or discouraged in our quest for peace."

Well, then, why not start? And if you want China to withdraw from North Korea, why have you made arrangements with Rhee for those US bases in the South? If South Korea really wanted to retain Rhee, or someone like him, the South is larger than the North, and it has been supplied with arms by US. Chinese troops poured into Korea only after great provocation by MacArthur, and after warning him to stay away from the

Yalu. There is, as this reporter sees it, no reason to suppose China wants to dominate Korea: there is every reason to hold that the US does.

Says Dulles, "If Soviet Russia and Communist China are willing to renounce ambitions which would be served by control of North Korea, then it should be possible to unite Korea under conditions which will enable the Koreans freely to manage their own affairs." Rhee was imported by the US, contrary to the wishes of the Koreans, who had formed a democratic government of their own. He has been maintained by the Americans, by force of arms, ever since. The way the South Koreans have "managed their own affairs" under this regime is shown by this from Burchett:

> Even the United Nations Commission was constrained to report in August 194 that under Rhee's "National Peace Protection Act", 89,710 people were arrested in South Korea in the eight months prior to April 30, 1949.

Referring to the elections in the South, May 30, 1950, Burchett recalls the facts:

> The National Independence Party of Kim Kyu-suk, whom the Americans at one time wanted to make president instead of Rhee, boycotted the elections. And with the entire machinery of the elections in his hands, Rhee was defeated. Even the western press had to admit that Rhee and his American policy suffered a severe defeat in the 1950 elections. Only 27 of Rhee's supporters in the previous Assembly were re-elected. As the progressive parties were banned and the middle-of-the-road parties were boycotting the elections, 128 of the 210 deputies elected were independents. Of the total Rhee could count on the support of only 45 (about 20%). As we will see later, this eventually led to Rhee's coup d'etat in mid-1952. Rhee the traitor refused to resign despite his defeat. He appointed a well-known dyed-in-the-wool pro-Japanese Choi Tong-ok as Premier and the Seoul Metropolitan Police Chief, Chang Tak-sang as Vice-Premier.
>
> A short time after the elections—in June 1950—the Fatherland Unification Democratic Front again made an appeal for peaceful unification of North and South. They offered to cooperate with all politicians in the South except eight who were named as national traitors. Among these were Syngman Rhee.....A personal invitation was sent to 300 members of parliament and other prominent leaders inviting them to a unification congress. An announcement was made over Pyongyang radio that two representatives from the FUDF and one journalist would deliver the invitations at a specified date and time at Ryo Hun on the 38th parallel near Kaesong. The news of the invitation was suppressed in the Seoul press. The delegates from the North turned up at Ryo Hun at the time mentioned, but were met with a furious hail of machine gun and mortar fire. One of the delegates was wounded. They reported back to Pyongyang but were asked to continue to South Korea and personally deliver the invitation. The three were arrested and tortured. The invitations were never delivered and nothing further had been heard of the delegates.
>
> After that the Presidium of the Supreme People's Assembly, on June 15, proposed to the National Assembly of South Korea to unify these two representative bodies and achieve a peaceful unification of the country. The reply nine days later was the assault by the ROK Army across the 38th parallel.

So much for the desire of Dulles that the Koreans "manage their own affairs"; for it will be remembered that, just before the war started, he assured Rhee that he agreed with all Rhee's policies.

A Worthless Guaranty:

Says Dulles, "The Russian people, like the French people, have not forgotten what their nation suffered from Hitlerite Germany during the second World War. They expect and they are entitled to, assurance against a repetition of such events." From another League of (Capitalist) Nations! The Russian people—and, we may be sure,

the Czechs—remember what that amounted to. The League was a complete failure because, like the present so-called UN, it always divided so as to form an effective majority to carry out the wishes of Monopoly Capitalism against the Socialist states. This came to a climax at Munich, where French and British tories gave way to Hitler and allowed him to annex Czechoslovakia—a deliberate throwing down of the mountain barrier which had been erected after WW I, protecting Russia from Germany.

Listen to Neurath, of the Nazi foreign ministry, in his cipher telegram to the German embassies in Italy, Great Britain, France, and the United States, Nov. 22, 1937. Reporting on the course of the talk of Hitler with Halifax, he said: "It is also worthy of note that Halifax even in his introductory remarks described Germany as the bulwark of the West against Bolshevism."

Preliminary to that same meeting between these two worthies, Ribbentrop reported (he was then ambassador to Britain) that he had a conversation with Halifax, and that "Halifax expressed his pleasure at having the opportunity of becoming personally acquainted with the Fuhrer and Chancellor, whose work he admires."

April 22, 1938, Woermann, Nazi Charge d'Affaires in Britain, reported to the Nazi foreign ministry about a conversation he had on that date with Butler, under secretary on German-British relations:

> .....Mr. Butler.....made himself the spokesman, as it were, of the younger generation in England—that is, a spokesman, as he said, of the intelligent, not the intellectual class. In contrast with the actual intellectuals, among whom there was now as in the past a strong antipathy to the authoritarian states, the circles close to him fully understood that Germany had to pursue her national aims in her own way. The German and the British peoples were of the same blood—which in itself meant a bond of unity.
>
> Butler then tried discreetly to direct the conversation to Czechoslovakia, but immediately inserted the remark himself that we probably could not yet speak frankly about certain subjects. But immediately thereafter he said that England was aware that Germany would attain "her next goal".

She did, and it was to gobble up the rest of Czechoslovakia—a country that France and Britain had sworn to protect.

In the same manner, the French, British and US reactionaries understood that Hitler and Mussolini had to attain their goal to crush the Spanish Republic. They understood about Abyssinia, too!

No: the Socialist countries are not going to rely on any such assurances!

Says Dulles, "No great country will calmly accept mutilation." But the capitalist allies, after WW I, turned on Russia and tore away her territory on the Baltic. And to this day, they are unwilling to admit that it has been taken back.

And Dulles says: "Our hope is that the Soviet Communist leaders, before it is too late, will recognize that love of God, love of country and sense of human dignity, always survive." Gott und the exploiters! "Moral Re-Armament", with its Buchman who said, "Thank God for Hitler"! George Seldes, in "1000 Americans", said:

> The Big Money is also invading the religious field. The National Association of Manufacturers has a special and very active propaganda department, the NAM Committee on Cooperation with Churches.....
>
> But who directs this big propaganda movement? Chairman of the committee is none other than Jasper E. Crane, vice president of E.I. duPont de Nemour & Co.

So, General Motors leading the way, Dulles is religious. Eisenhower, too. But, said the Christian teacher, Jesus, not all who called out, "Lord, Lord", were headed for the kingdom of heaven, which was to be occupied by those who had looked out for the poor and suffering on earth. In other words, as the Negro spiritual puts it, "Everybody talkin' about heaven ain't goin' there!"

Hypocrisy Unlimited:

This from Dulles: "The American people, like many others, hold to the belief whic our founders expressed in the Declaration of Independence, that governments derive their just powers only from the consent of the governed." Is that why official US is palling up with Franco Spain; allied with the Vatican, arch-enemy of democracy; is chummy with "presidents" Chiang, Peron, Salazar, Trujillo, Batista of Cuba, and abou every reactionary dictator in the world, not forgetting Rhee?

Is that why people in this country are forbidden, under the Smith Act, even to "conspire to advocate" the overthrow of the present US set-up, in flat contradiction to the Declaration of Independence? Political prisoners charged under this Act, on the testimoney of paid stooges of the government, are dragged off to jail, hands manacled.

These McCarran and Smith measures are modeled on a "gag" law introduced by the Adenauer government in W. Germany, July 9, 1951, and pushed through with the greatest haste. The "White Book on the American and British Policy of Intervention in Wes Germany and the Revival of German Imperialism", completed Aug. 4, 1941, says:

> Speaking in favour of the law the SPD deputy Dr. Arndt stated that those who drafted it had followed "classical patterns" by extending the definition of high treason as defined in the Weimar Republic to include the preparations thereto. (Emphasis added.) By referring to the "classical character" of the laws taken as pattern Dr. Arndt threw an interesting light on the Bonn state itself. These "classical patterns" were nothing more nor less than the nazi emergency regulations of Feb. 4, 1933; the nazi law of April 24, 1934, which revised paragraphs 80 to 93a of the Criminal Code; and the so-called "Heimtucke Gesetz" (treason law) of Dec. 20, 1934, with the help of which the German fascists brought all friends of peace to the executioner's block, to the concentration camps and priso the law with the help of which Hitler fascism stifled the real voice of the Germar people in blood.

Atomic Weapons:

Says Dulles, "Governments which exert themselves without reserve to the creation of ever more powerful methods of mass destruction, which tolerate no delay and spare no expense in these matters, and which at the same time are dilatory, evasive or negative toward curing the situations which could bring these destructive forces into play, cannot but stand morally condemned." Well! from that you would certainly understand that it was Russia that threw the Bombs at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, for political purposes only (see Forrestal Diary). That led off with the Hydrogen Bomb. That now talks of the C-Bomb, to destroy all life on earth.

Contrary to the falsehoods persistently fed the American people, Russia has long ex pressed willingness to abolish the use of Atomic Weapons, and further willingness to permit inspection.

In November 1949, Mr. Vyshinsky told the "UN" General Assembly:

> We open our doors to control, but you have distorted the word control. To us it means to verify and check, but to you it means management. The Soviet Union will not, and never shall, allow foreign ownership of its lands and enterprises.....
>
> Two years ago, the Russian representative made it clear that inspection would entail inspection of all enterprises, starting with mines and winding up with plant for production of nuclear fuel.....Periodic inspection means inspection at intervals—not at set intervals, but as determined by necessity, whenever the international control commission deems it necessary. It is obvious that there would be no unanimity rule, no veto. To put an end to slander and insinuation, we make it quite clear that decisions would be by a majority of votes.

What was the proposal of the USA? It refused to sign an agreement to stop the use of Atomic warfare outright. It proposed gradual disarmament in other fields, and that inspectors (of the Major Grow variety, presumably,) be allowed full access to all Rus-

sian war factories, mines, etc. At which Vyshinsky quite properly took the attitude that such naivete was laughable.

It is not Russia—it is the United States—which obstructs disarmament and particularly the prohibition of Atomic Weapons. But you would never surmise it from Dulles' hypocritical blathering!

Note also that only the US and Japan refuse to sign the convention against Germ Warfare—something to give pause to the sanctimonious.

Says Dulles, "The American people, in the past, have often shown, by generous deeds, their friendship with the Russian people.....The United States does not want to see Russia encircled by hostile peoples." The American government showed its friendship by joining the counter-revolutionary coalition led by Churchill, which was defeated in 1919. (The troops of Kolshak were clothed and weaponed by the United States.) Herbert Hoover, patron saint of the present Republican regime, brought about the Horthy dictatorship in Hungary, a very "friendly" neighbor for socialist Russia! — "Food is a weapon".

Talk for Fools:

Secretary of State Dulles: "Our creed does not call for exporting revolution and inciting others to violence."

Congressman Charles J. Kersten of Wisconsin, author of "Mutual Security Act": "To say that terror would play no part in a liberation movement in Eastern Europe is to be utterly unconversant with what constitutes a liberation movement."

To substantiate the foregoing claim of Dulles, he will have to disassociate himself from the philosophy of the late Ernst Reuter, mayor of W. Berlin, who stated it was high time to stop thinking only in terms of defence, and requested increased American help for Berlin. (Die Welt, Hamburg, Feb. 28, 1951.)

Also, Dulles will have to part from Jakob Kaiser, head of Adenauer's Ministry for All-German Affairs, who has talked about rolling back Russia with a responsive echo, at the time, from Dulles and Eisenhower. March 2, 1951, at the Party Congress of the Austrian People's Party in Salzburg, Kaiser said: "A real Europe can only be formed when German unity has been restored. This includes, I must remind you, not only Germany, but also Austria, part of Switzerland, the Saar and Alsace-Lorraine."

Will that new German army—led by "former" nazis, and manned by Germans who were brought up under Hitler to despise democracy—fall in with the present Dulles (alleged) policy of sweetness and light?

The Dulles address is talk for fools. The London Daily Telegraph of Jan. 22, 1952, quoted him:

> Mr. Dulles, architect of the Japanese Peace Treaty, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee today, in asking for its ratification, that the United States must take positive steps to assure the down-fall of the present Moscow-dominated Government of China. (Quoted by Herbert Morrison, in House of Commons, Jan. 25.)

Certainly this means inciting to violence, and it means world war.

* * * * * * * * * *

Mrs. Alexander Horr's penetrating writings are well-known to readers of ONE, under her maiden name, Louise Harding. In association with her late husband, she has been active for many years in progressive causes, having been especially prominent in the Tom Mooney case. Her family is intertwined with many famous names in American history, both political and artistic. Among other publications in which her work appears regularly at the present time is THE WORD, published by Guy Aldred, Glasgow.

ONE

(Formerly The Protestant)

NOVEMBER 1953

EDITOR
Kenneth Leslie

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Rev. John Tunnicliffe

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Archbishop Adam
Rev. William T. Baird
Rev. Russell C. Barbour
Rev. Reginald H. Bass
Rev. C. Harrison Becker
Bishop Albert Bereczky
Henrietta Buckmaster
Rev. R. Alex Cameron
Rev. Boise Dent
Bishop Laszlo Dezsery
Rev. I Jonathan Domas
Rev. H. deM. DuBois
Rev. Merlin W. Ennis
Rev. Stanley Evans
Rev. John Fekete
Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher
Rev. Erwin A. Gaede
Rev. Sidney E. Harris
Rev. A. Eustace Haydon
Rev. Daniel Hughes
Rev. Hewlett Johnson
Rev. Imre Kadar
Rev. J. Spencer Kennard, Jr.
Rev. Ferenc H. Kiss
John A. Lee
David Lord
Rev. E. D. McGowan
Prof. John Macmurray
Rev. John A. Maynard
Rev. Laszlo Michnay
Rev. Joseph G. Moore
Rev. J. Murdock Palmer
Bishop John Peter
Ida Pruit
Rev. D. McKeen Reid
Leslie Roberts
Raymond Robins
Rev. R. Ross-Shannon
Watson Thomson
Bishop Lajos Veto
Rev. Wilfred Wakefield
Rev. Etienne Watts
Prof. Henry N. Wieman
Rev. Claude Williams
Rev. Mercer Wilson

ONE is published monthly by New Christian Books, 69 Inglis Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia. By subscription only. 12 issues $3.25. Checks and money orders payable to **New Christian Books. No agents.**

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

ONE

He hath made of one blood
All Nations

November 1953 Edited by Kenneth Leslie

LOUISE HARDING

ANSWERS

DULLES

Vol. X, No. 1. 30 Cents